

REMARKS

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1-3, 6, 7 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hidaka, (U.S. Patent No. 5,028,919). Claims 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidaka in view of Official Notice. Claims 1-17 are pending.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 14-17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims have been substantially so amended, and request removal the rejection and objections.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a remote control device that is configured to facilitate control of a plurality of electronic devices, comprising an input device that is configured to accept a user input and provides therefrom a control signal for control of a first device of the plurality of electronic devices, and a receiver that is configured to receive a parameter from a

second device of the plurality of electronic devices, and a transmitter that is configured to communicate the parameter from the second device to the first device, and communicate the control signal to the first device to effect the control of an appliance function of the first device. Independent claims 6 and 11 recites similar limitations.

Hidaka fails to teach show or imply at least the limitations of a receiver that is configured to receive a parameter from a second device of the plurality of electronic devices, and a transmitter that is configured to communicate the parameter from the second device to the first device, and communicate the control signal to the first device to effect the control of an appliance function of the first device, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action indicates that these limitations are disclosed in Hidaka in fig. 2, col. 1 line 50 through col. 2. line 7). Applicants respectfully disagree. In these sections, Hidaka discloses a learning remote control device, which when in learning mode, can write data from a receiving section (i.e. a first device) into control keys for use in an operation mode (of the first device). Thus, Hidaka, in contrast to the present invention, does not disclose or imply, that the transmitter that is configured to communicate a received

parameter from a second device to a first device, and communicate a control signal to the first device to effect the control of an appliance function of the first device, as recited in amended claim 1.


For at least the above cited reasons, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 6, and 11 are patentable over Action indicates that these limitations are disclosed in Hidaka.

The other claims in this application are dependent upon the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable once the independent claims are allowed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

The applicants submit that the claims, as they now stand, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted

By   
Daniel J. Piotrowski, Reg 42,079  
Patent Attorney  
(914) 333-9624

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being  
deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as  
first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On July 15, 2004

By Eric Chapin